**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of the above identified patent application are hereby requested. Claims 1-9, 21-29, and 37-58 are now in the application with claims 1, 21, and 45 being independent. Claims 1, 8, 9, 21, 28, and 29 have been amended. Claims 39-58 are new.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

The Office (Action of November 20, 2006) rejected claims 1-9, 11-29, 31-33 and 36-38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,275,225 to Rangarajan et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,907,326 to Atkin et al.

Amended claim 1 recites (underlining added for emphasis) "…after execution of the computer program has begun, <u>automatically defining a user interface</u> of the program by: reading a <u>function description</u> of a first function to be provided by the user interface <u>on the fly at run time</u>, the function description comprising instructions to handle user interface events; executing logic on the fly at run time to select an <u>appearance description</u> of a first appearance to be presented by the user interface; <u>associating</u> the function description and the appearance description <u>on the fly at run time</u> into an executable form; executing the executable form of the user interface to generate the user interface with the associated function description and appearance description; and executing logic to <u>independently change</u> one of the <u>function description</u> and the <u>appearance description</u> <u>during program execution</u>."

Rangarajan et al. do not disclose <u>independently changing</u> one of the function description and the appearance description during program execution. Rangarajan et al. (Col. 4, lines 63-64) disclose (underlining added for emphasis) "The <u>configuration</u> includes the <u>GUI features, devices and views</u> that are desired by the administrator." Further, Rangarajan et al. (Col. 9, lines 41-47) disclose (underlining added for emphasis) "A 'modify configuration' SCA 821 invokes the wizard process 300, previously described, but uses <u>a reconstructed data structure</u> that corresponds to the <u>currently selected configuration</u> (instead of <u>the original data structure</u> used when creating a <u>new configuration</u>) and selects the appropriate end node as the wizard's starting point." Additionally, Rangarajan et al. (Col. 6, lines 7-11) disclose that (underlining added for emphasis) "…the wizard process 300 continues to a 'create configuration' decision procedure 304 that determines whether the invocation of the wizard process 300 was for the purpose of <u>creating</u>

a new configuration or modifying an existing configuration." Thus, Rangarajan et al. teach that an entire configuration is subject to the modification process. Therefore, Rangarajan et al. do not disclose executing logic to independently change one of the function description and the appearance description during program execution.

Rangarajan et al. also do not disclose associating the function description and the appearance description on the fly at run time into an executable form. To the contrary, Rangarajan et al. (Col. 5, lines 39-43) disclose (underlining added for emphasis) "After loading the configuration, the initialization process 200 continues to a 'create GUI according to selected configuration' procedure 215 that processes the information stored in the selected configuration to create a user configured GUI that contains the selected feature set." As discussed above, Rangarajan et al. (Col. 4, lines 63-64) also disclose that the configuration includes the GUI features, devices and views. Thus, Rangarajan et al. teach that the GUI is created in accordance with information stored in a single configuration. Therefore, Rangarajan et al. also do not disclose, teach, or suggest associating the function description and the appearance description on the fly at run time into an executable form, as is claimed. Moreover, Atkin et al. also do not disclose, teach, or suggest associating a function description and an appearance description on the fly at run time into an executable form.

Moreover, a proper motivation to combine Rangarajan et al. and Atkin et al. has not been established. The Office (Action of November 20, 2006 at 4) asserts that "The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to enable cultural profiles of an application to be dynamically changed while the application is running (Atkin, col. 3, lines 59-61)." However, Rangarajan et al. (Col. 8, lines 57-65) disclose (underlining added for emphasis):

> If the modify entry SCA is activated, a modify procedure 719 is invoked that recreates the wizard data structure that resulted in the selected configuration. Next the wizard is invoked indicating the terminal node in the data structure that generated the configuration. Thus, the user is able to back track over the previous interrogatories and modify them as appropriate. Then the profile manager process 700 continues to the `user invoked event` procedure 709 for subsequent user invoked events.

Thus, Rangarajan et al. teach that a configuration is changed by modifying previous answers to interrogatories. Therefore, Rangarajan et al. have no apparent need for changing cultural profiles as taught by Atkin et al.

For at least these reasons, independent claim 1 is allowable over Rangarajan et al. in view of Atkin et al. Claims 2-9, 37, and 38 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claim 1.

Further, claim 21 and 45 include elements similar to those contained in claim 1. For example, claim 21 recites (underlining added for emphasis) "...read a <u>function description</u> of a first function to be provided by the user interface <u>on the fly at run time</u>, the function description comprising instructions to handle user interface events; execute on the fly at run time logic to select an <u>appearance description</u> of a first appearance to be presented by the user interface; <u>associate</u> the function description and the appearance description on the fly at run time; execute the user interface with the associated function description and appearance description; and execute logic to <u>independently change</u> one of the <u>function description</u> and the <u>appearance description during program execution</u>."

Similarly, claim 45 recites (underlining added for emphasis) "...a processor configured to perform operations comprising: reading a <u>function description</u> of a first function to be provided by the user interface <u>on the fly at run time</u>, wherein the function description comprises instructions to handle user interface events; executing on the fly at run time logic to select an <u>appearance description</u> of a first appearance to be presented by the user interface; <u>associating</u> the function description and the appearance description on the fly at run time into an executable form; executing the executable form of the user interface to generate the user interface with the associated function description and appearance description; and executing logic to <u>independently change</u> one of the <u>function description</u> and the <u>appearance description during program execution</u>." Therefore, claims 21 and 45 are allowable for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claim 1. Additionally, claims 22-29 and 42-44 depend from claim 21, and claims 46-58 depend from claim 45. Therefore, claims 22-29, 42-44, and 46-58 are at least allowable based on claims 21 and 45.

## Concluding Comments

The foregoing comments made with respect to the positions taken by the Examiner are not to be construed as acquiescence with other positions of the Examiner that have not been explicitly contested. Accordingly, the above arguments for patentability of a claim should not be construed as implying that there are not other valid reasons for patentability of that claim or other claims.

In view of the above remarks, claims 9-20 and 29-46 should be in condition for allowance, and a formal notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

Please apply the fee of $790 for request for continued examination and $120 for a one-month extension of time, and any other applicable charges or credits, to Deposit Account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:  March 20, 2007

William E. Hunter
Reg. No. 47,671

Fish & Richardson P.C.
PTO Customer No. 21876
Telephone:  (858) 678-5070
Facsimile:  (858) 678-5099